

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed April 4, 2003. In the office action the Examiner:

- Allowed claims 8-16;
- Objected to Figure 1B for omission of a legend indicating that prior art is represented;
- Objected to the specification for a typographical error at page 2, line 19;
- Objected to the specification for a typographical error at page 2, line 27;
- Objected to claims 1 - 7 for a typographical error;
- Rejected claims 1, 6-7, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gasbarron et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,823);
- Rejected claims 1, 6-7, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,426,984).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1 - 32.

REMARKS CONCERNING REVISED FIGURES

Revised Figure 1B is included in Appendix A.

Figure 1B is revised by adding "(Prior Art)" under the figure number, as request by the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the proposed drawing changes.

REMARKS CONCERNING SPECIFICATION REVISIONS

The revisions to the specification correct typographic errors and, in the case of the correction on page 8, correct a minor inconsistency that is obvious from immediately following text (i.e., 3.5 is a fractional number, not a non-fractional number). No new matter has been added.

REMARKS CONCERNING CLAIMS OBJECTIONS AND REJECTIONS

Claims 1-7 have been objected to because of an omitted hyphen. Claim 1 has been amended accordingly.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejection - Gasbarro et al.

Claims 1, 6-7, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gasbarro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,823), which, according to the examiner, “discloses a slave device for use in a master-slave system, comprising: ...a clock node (161 in figure 6) to receive a clock signal (RCLKD); a phase-to-master phase signal (RCLK0 in figure 3); and a phase-from[-]master phase signal (RCLK 1 in figure 3).” It is noted that the RCLK1 and RCLK0 in Gasbarro are actually received by distinct devices (not by a single slave device as required by claim 1), and therefore the applicant has assumed that the Examiner intended to identify the three signals as RCLK1, TCLK1 and RCLKD.

Respectfully, Gasbarro does not teach the use of three distinct clock circuit nodes of a slave device at which the slave device receives three distinct clock-related signals, i.e., clock, phase-to-master, phase-from-master. The phase-to-master and phase-from-master signals are external signals received by the slave, at respective nodes named in claim 1. Claim 1 has been revised to clarify that the “clock signal” is also received from a source external to the slave. The slave devices in Gasbarro receive only two clock related signals from external sources, not three as required by claim 1. Further, the received signals in Gasbarro are both clock signals with phase information embedded, which is completely distinct from the scenario of claim 1 in which the “to-master” and “from-master” phase information is conveyed by signals distinct from the received clock signal. Gasbarro simply does not teach this separation of phase information from frequency information into distinct signals received by a slave device. Thus, Gasbarro does not teach each and every element of claim 1, and furthermore Gasbarro does not teach or suggest the underlying theory of operation on which claim 1 is based.

The same analysis is applicable to claim 17 of the present invention.

Respectfully, Applicant requests that claims 1 and 17 be allowed. Since claims 6-7 depend from claim 1, claims 6-7 should be allowed for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowed as detailed above.

With regard to claim 20 (or perhaps claim 22), the examiner noted that “(3) regarding claim 20: generating said phase signal from said clock signal (132 in figure 3).” Applicant observes that the phrase “generating said phase signal...” is in fact represented in claim 22 of the present invention (in application as originally submitted), rather than in claim 20.

Accordingly, since claim 22 depends from claim 17, claim 22 should be allowed for at least the reasons that claim 17 is allowed as detailed above.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) - Perino et al.

Claims 1, 6-7, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,426,984), which, according to the examiner, “discloses a slave device for use in a master-slave system, comprising: ...a clock node (B) to receive a clock signal (SENSE); a phase-to-master node (A) to receive a phase-to-master phase signal (Clock 1); and a phase-from-master node (B) to receive a phase-from[-]master phase signal (Clock 2).”

Respectfully, as per Gasbarro, Perino does not teach the use of three distinct clock circuit nodes for receiving three distinct externally provided signals, i.e., clock, phase-to-master, phase-from-master. Perino, in fact, teaches only the use of two clock circuit nodes, i.e., clock 1 and clock 2, having a common frequency. Thus, Perino does not teach each and every element of claim 1.

The same analysis is applicable to claim 17 of the present invention.

Analogous to the discussion above re. Gasbarro, Applicant requests that claims 1, 6-7, 17 and 22 be allowed over Perino.

New Claims 27-32

With respect to the new claims 27-32, the new claims are all dependent claims, and therefore should be allowable at least for the same reasons as their parent claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 493-4935, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Date: June 12, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Gary S. Williams

31,066

(Reg. No.)

*

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304
(650) 493-4935